

**REMARKS**

Applicants appreciate the thorough examination of the application that is reflected in the Office Action dated May 8, 2003. Applicants amend claims 18 and 23 as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants also amend claim 14. Claims 14-24 are pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

**Information Disclosure Statement**

Submitted concurrently herewith is an IDS citing references from the International Search Report of Miyashita et al. cited by the Office in this Action.

**Terminal Disclaimer**

Claims 14-23 were rejected for obviousness-type double patenting. With respect to claims 15-23 the Examiner asserts that the ink-jet method is well-known in the art for liquid deposition in a patterned manner.

Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with this ground of rejection, to expedite the prosecution of this application, Applicants file a terminal disclaimer with respect to claims 14-23 to overcome this rejection.

Thus, Applicants submit that this ground of rejection is rendered moot.

**Objections to Claims 18 and 23**

Claims 18 and 23 were objected to for informalities. To expedite prosecution of this application, Applicant amends claims 18 and 23 as suggested by the Examiner to render this ground of objection moot.

**Art-Based Rejections**

Claims 14, 15, 19, 20 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang (USPN 5,276,380) in view of Miyashita et al. (WO 98/242271), claims 16, 27, 21, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang in view of Miyashita et al. and further in view of Shi et al. (USPN 5,773,931), and claims 18 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Tang in view of Miyashita et al. and further in view of Niboshi et al. (USPN 6,198,215). Claims 14, 16, 17, 19, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagayama et al. (EP 0 732 868) in view of Miyashita et al. (WO 98/242271).

In rejecting independent claim 14, the Examiner concedes that both Tang (USPN 5,276,380) and Nagayama et al. (EP 0 732 868) fail to teach or suggest forming an electroluminescent material layer "by means of an ink-jet method," as required by claim 14. The Examiner cites Miyashita et al. (WO 98/242271), commonly assigned to SEC, as teaching this feature.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest, for example, "forming an electroluminescent material layer in between banks with liquid material such that at least a bottom region between the banks is filled with the liquid material," as required by claim 14.

Applicants acknowledge that Tang discloses a method for manufacturing the EL medium in a vacuum chamber. As discussed, for example, at col. 8, lines 55-64 of the Tang reference:

One of the distinct advantages of the present invention is that the organic EL medium and the second electrode elements can be successively formed in the same vacuum chamber without intervening handling or exposure to ambient air and, specifically, the moisture contained in ambient air. Immediately following deposition of the second electrode elements, the device can be directly encapsulated or placed in a housing, so that the second electrode elements and organic EL medium receive only a very limited exposure to ambient air.

However, the Tang reference fails to teach or even suggest using a liquid material to form the EL layer. Applicant further submits that Miyashita et al., Shi et al., Niboshi et al., and Nagayama et al. also do not teach or suggest these limitations of claim 14.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least the above recitations of claim 14. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is patentable over the cited references. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 15-24 are separately patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 14, and also because those claims require additional novel features that are not taught or suggested by the cited references.

**Dependent claims 16 and 21**

For example, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest, that “the banks are formed such that an angle between at least one side face of the banks and a face on which the banks are installed is an acute angle, and the second electrode group is formed by depositing the second electrode material by oblique vapor deposition from a direction confronting the side face or a vertical direction of the banks,” as required by claim 16.

Applicants submit that Figures 4 and 6 of the Shi reference do not teach or suggest this feature.

For exemplary benefits associated with forming “the banks such that an angle between at least one side face of the banks and a face on which the banks are installed is an acute angle, and the second electrode group is formed by depositing the second electrode material by oblique vapor deposition from a direction confronting the side face or a vertical direction of the banks,” see, for example, at page 4, line 21- page 5, line 2 and page 7, lines 1-10 of the present application. The claims should not be construed as being limited by this embodiment or by the particular benefits described.

Applicants submit that dependent claims 16 and 21 are therefore separately patentable over the cited references, and are in condition for allowance.

**Dependent claims 17 and 22**

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest, for example, that “the banks are formed such that an angle between at least one side face of the banks and a top face thereof is an acute angle, and the second electrode group is formed by vapor deposition from a vertical direction of the banks,” as required by claim 17. For exemplary benefits associated with forming the banks “the banks are formed such that an angle between at least one side face of the banks and a top face thereof is an acute angle, and the second electrode group is formed by vapor deposition from a vertical direction of the banks,” see, for example, at page 5, lines 3-8 and at page 7, lines 11-15 of the present application. The claims should not be construed as being limited by this embodiment or by the particular benefits described.

Applicants submit that Figures 4 and 6 of the Shi reference do not teach or suggest this feature, and therefore dependent claims 17 and 22 are separately patentable over the cited references, and are in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6793 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Attorney Docket No. 81756.0005  
Patent Application No. 10/090,597

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: July 31, 2003

By: Erin P. Madill  
Erin P. Madill  
Registration No. 46,893  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Phone: 213-337-6700  
Fax: 213-337-6701